

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 4-14, and 16-37 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29 are independent. In the Office Action dated May 18, 2007, Claims 1, 4-14, and 16-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 4-7, 9-14, 16-17, and 19-37 remain in this application with dependant Claims 8 and 18 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Patel for the courtesy of a telephone interview on July 23, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Information Disclosure Statements

Applicants hereby request the Examiner to kindly acknowledge and consider the Information Disclosure Statement, the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, and the Second Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement 1449 Forms filed on May 23, 2002, July 16, 2002, and November 14, 2002, respectively.

III. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated May 18, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4-14, and 16-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,920,846 ("*Storch*") in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2007/0094387 ("*Hahn*"). Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "the electronic message being separated, stored, and maintained as at least two portions being respectively customized for transmission to different groups of technicians, customization, storage, and maintenance of the at least two customized, stored, and maintained portions being dependent on a plurality of profile characteristics stored in the administration system; modifying, by an administration system, at least one of the customized, stored, and maintained portions of the electronic message." Amended Claims 11, 14, 21 and 29 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least in paragraph [0027].

Consistent with embodiments of the invention, a communications network may be any communications network that permits a computer to access a remote server. (See specification, paragraph [0013], lines 1-2.) A protocol server may provide a protocol and middleware interface between an access device and a technician server. (See specification, paragraph [0015], lines 1-2.) In addition, two or more portions of an electronic message may be customized for transmission to different technician groups. (See specification, paragraph [0027], lines 1-3.) For example, this customization of the

two or more portions may be dependent on a number of profile characteristics stored in an administration system for various technicians. (See specification, paragraph [0027], lines 3-5.) Furthermore, the electronic message may be maintained and stored in an administration system. (See specification, paragraph [0026], lines 6-9.)

In contrast, *Storch* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Storch* merely discloses that when a Work Force Administration/Dispatch Out (WFA/DO) system determines a best job match for a technician, the WFA/DO system transmits a service order copy to the technician via a technician access unit (TAU) and system (TAS). (See col. 71, lines 44-47.) In addition, information is transmitted directly from an Assigning SOAC to the WFA/DO and then to an appropriate outside technician via the TAU. (See col. 72, lines 43-48.) Consequently, *Storch* does not disclose an electronic message being customized during transmission, much less for customization, storage, and maintenance of the electronic message for transmission to different groups of technicians. No where in *Storch* does it disclose the message having multiple customized portions.

Furthermore, *Hahn* does not overcome *Storch*'s deficiencies. *Hahn* merely discloses that a message components unit may create a number of components that correspond to structural elements of an e-mail message, for example, a header, a separator, and a body. (See paragraph [0056], line 1-6.) In *Hahn*, modified portions may be combined to form an enhanced message stream. (See paragraph [0057], lines 3-4.) Additionally, *Hahn* discloses that a message manager does not store an input message's complete representation in memory. Instead, *Hahn*'s message manager may buffer the message stream's smallest possible unit until a determination can be

made about that unit's disposition, at which point the results are placed in an output stream. (See paragraph [0041], lines 4-9.) *Hahn* does not disclose the customization, storage and maintenance of an electronic message for transmission to different groups of technicians. Rather, *Hahn* merely discloses that a message manger places few demands on a host platform's computing/storage resources by minimizing the memory amount required. (See paragraph [0041], lines 9-12.)

Combining *Storch* with *Hahn* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Storch* and *Hahn*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose, for example, "the electronic message being separated, stored, and maintained as at least two portions being respectively customized for transmission to different groups of technicians, customization, storage, and maintenance of the at least two customized, stored, and maintained portions being dependent on a plurality of profile characteristics stored in the administration system; modifying, by an administration system, at least one of the customized, stored, and maintained portions of the electronic message" as recited by amended Claim 1. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29.

Dependent Claims 4-7, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 19-20, 22-28, and 30-37 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, and 29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 4-7, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 19-20, 22-28, and 30-37.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: July 24, 2007

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:YE:mdc

